

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for carefully reviewing the present application. The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on Oct 12, 2005 regarding claims 1-20. The applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein.

Claims 1, 8 and 20 are amended to particularly point out that the display panel comprises one display region having a plurality of pixels surrounded by one frame region. The support of the above amendments can be found in Fig. 4, in which the display region 63 comprises a plurality of pixels, such as the regions of R, G, B shown in Fig. 4, wherein the definition of pixels is also well known to one of ordinary skilled in the art (see "081"'s claim 1). Claims 1, 8 and 20 are also amended to particularly point out that three color filter layers are formed simultaneously on the display region and the frame region of the panel display, wherein portions of the three color filter layers located on the frame region are stacked on with each other, and other portions of the three color filter layers located on the display region are coplanar and adjacent to each other (see Fig. 4 and the related description of the specification). Claim 14 is amended to particularly point out the process of forming the planarization layer (see page 20 line 23 to page 21 line 2 of the specification). Thus, claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The amended claims contain no new matter nor raise new issues.

The above amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over cited references. Favorable reconsideration is requested accordingly.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Manabu Sawasaki et al. (US 2004/0114081) (hereinafter referred to as “081”)

As explicitly recited in the amended claims 1, 8 and 20, the claimed display region comprises a plurality of pixels, and the frame region surrounding the display region also surrounds these pixels. Moreover, the claimed invention is directed to a liquid crystal display panel comprising a thin film transistor array substrate having one display region having a plurality of pixels surrounded by one frame region, wherein three color filter layers are formed simultaneously on the display region and the frame region, The present invention is featured in that portions of the filter color layers located on the frame region are formed as a uniform framework stacked with three color filter layers so as to prevent ambient light from projecting onto the frame region, and the frame region also serves as a spacer whereby a cell gap between the thin film transistor array substrate and an opposite substrate is uniformly controlled.

In contrast, “081” teaches that the bus lines 25 and 26 and the resin overlap sections 32 formed on the TFT substrate 8 provides the function of a black matrix (frame region), wherein light can be blocked by forming any one of the resin CF layers R, G and B on the TFTs instead of the resin overlap sections 32 shown in FIG. 1. Apparently, “081” discloses a plurality of frame regions each of which surrounds one pixel (see Fig. 29 and Fig. 30). Further, the black matrix taught in “081” is generally formed from by

overlapping two resin color filter layers (see paragraph 134 lines 6 to 11), and has three resin color filter layers R, B and G laminated only in the vicinity of the intersection between the gate bus line 25 and the drain bus line 26 (see Fig 4 and paragraph 7 lines 8 to 11), i.e. the black matrix (frame region) taught by “081” is not a uniform three-layer stacked framework, wherein the portions of the black matrix with the three color filter layers are merely located on the intersections between the gate bus lines and the drain bus lines, and the other portion of the black matrix is formed from two layers.

The Federal Circuit reiterated that “a rejection for anticipation under section 102 requires that each and every limitation of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference.” In re Paulsen, 31 USPQ 2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Accordingly, since the structure of the black matrix taught by “081” is different from the frame region disclosed in the claimed invention, claims 1, 8 and 20 of the claimed invention cannot be anticipated by “081”. As to claims 2-7 and 9-19, by virtue of their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 8 respectively, claims 2-7 and 9-9 are also patentable over “081” Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the section 102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “081”.

Just as stated above, since claims 1 and 8 are allowable, claims 6 and 14-16 each of which depends from independent claims 1 and 8 respectively are also allowable.

Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that the section 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any remaining issues to be resolved, the applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview.

Date: _____

1/12/06

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Timothy J. Keefer
Reg. No. 35,567
Attorney for Applicant
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
55 E. Monroe St., Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60603-5803
Telephone: (312) 269-8552
Facsimile: (312) 269-8869
e-mail: tkeefe@seyfarth.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. Mail Stop: AMENDMENTS

Date: _____

1/12/06
Consuelo Henry